



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,794	03/25/2004	Lonny MacDougall	13006.00041	9727

7590 06/30/2005

Steven Thrasher
391 Sandhill Dr.
Richardson, TX 75080

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THU V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3661

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/810,794

Applicant(s)

MACDOUGALL ET AL.

Examiner

Thu Nguyen

Art Unit

3661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed on April 15, 2005 has been entered. By this amendment, all claims 1-17 are now pending in the application.

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In the specification page 8, line 1, the disclosed "second sensor 122" is not illustrated in fig.1. Fig.1 should illustrate a sensor 122.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 7-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al (US 2004/0058563) in view of Henri-pierre (FR 2 715 184) and further in view of Mejean et al (US 2003/0182863):

As per claim 1, Kobayashi teaches a motor vehicle with child lock, the system comprises: a motor vehicle child lock (para 0035, 0038); a sensor H2, H3 (fig.2) for detecting when the child lock is engaged (para 0052). Kobayashi does not explicitly disclose an indicator coupled to

the sensor and providing the status of the child lock when the door is in open position. However, Kobayashi teaches connecting the microcontroller to the sensors H2, H3 for receiving child lock status (para 0052) and suggests providing an indicator 36 (fig.2) (para 0039). Further, Henri-Pierre suggests using electronic data processing indicator 5 (fig.1) for indicating the status of the child lock (last page, second paragraph of the attached translation), and Mejean teaches a processor capable of recognizing the status of the child lock and the opening of the door (para 0027; 0045); with the combined teaching of Henri-Pierre and Mejean, reporting the child lock status according to the opening or closing status of the vehicle door would have been an obvious matter of design choice. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the indicator taught by Henri-Pierre and Mejean to the system of Kobayashi in order to facilitate informing whether the child lock is activating according to the status of the door.

As per claim 2-3, 7, using a light LED indicator for indicating child lock status, and logically coupling between the indicator and the child lock for controlling the indicator would have been well known.

As per claim 8-9, embedding a light in the door lock and implementing the indicator a location approximate to the lock would have been both known and obvious matter of design choice.

As per claim 10-12, refer to claims 1-2, 9 above.

As per claim 13, Henri-Pierre suggest using color indicator (page 4, third paragraph or the translation), moreover, selecting well known red LED for reporting the status of the child lock system would have been a mere matter of design choice.

4. Claims 4, 6, 14, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al (US 2004/0058563) in view of Henri-pierre (FR 2 715 184) and further in view of Mejean et al (US 2003/0182863) and Obradovich (US 2002/0055811).

As per claim 4, 6, 14, Henri-Pierre suggests including audible indicator (page 4, second paragraph of the translation), and Obradovich teaches the important of providing a speaker for informing information to the driver (para 0131, 0137). Further, Obradovich teaches recording a sound a play the sound on the speaker (para 0132). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a speaker to the system of Kobayashi in order to provide the status of the child lock in voice.

As per claim 17, providing verbal warning as audio warning would have been well known.

5. Claims 5, 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi et al (US 2004/0058563) in view of Henri-pierre (FR 2 715 184) and further in view of Mejean et al (US 2003/0182863) and Trammell et al (US 5,927,775).

As per claim 5, 15, Kobayashi teaches a mechanical indicator (para 0039). Further Trammell suggests including color codes as mechanical indicator (col.11, lines 41-52). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide color code to the door lock indicator of Kobayashi in order to allow the driver to quickly recognize the child lock status by checking on the color code of the indicator.

With respect to claim 16, painting a word instead of using color code as an indicator would have been known and would have been a mere matter of design choice.

Response to Arguments

In response to the explanation to the objection to the specification, the second sensor 122 is not illustrated in fig.1. It is recommended that the applicant should add the sensor 122 to the diagram in fig.1, and timely submit the corrected drawing sheet of fig.1 in the next correspondence.

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-6967. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F (7:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3661

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

June 23, 2005



THUY V. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER